PLACE LABEL HERE

Applying Institution:

Reader:

MISSOURI SIOP INITIATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA 2007-2008

I – COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY OF PARTNERSHIP	(24 points possible)
II – PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCHED-BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	(47 points possible)
III – EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN	(21 points possible)
IV – INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE AND PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY	(15 points possible)
V – BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS	(22 points possible)
	TOTAL POINTS RECEIVED/129

I. COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY OF PARTNERSHIP - (24 points possible)

Does the program leadership team have the expertise to implement and sustain a grades 6-12 SIOP academy? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Leadership team is composed of individuals that:	
 have strong content and pedagogical backgrounds in mathematics, science and ESOL education at the secondary level; 	
 can demonstrate extensive evidence of successful management and sustainability of prior large scale projects; and 	
• can demonstrate evidence of successful national and state-wide networking efforts between secondary school level mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, higher education faculty, and scientists, engineers, and/or mathematicians in the field.	(3-4 points)
Leadership team is composed of individuals that:	
 have adequate content and pedagogical backgrounds in mathematics, science and ESOL education at the secondary school level; 	
 can demonstrate adequate evidence of successful management and sustainability of prior large scale projects; and 	
 can demonstrate evidence of successful regional networking with secondary school level mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, higher education faculty, and scientists, engineers, and/or mathematicians in the field. 	(1-2 points)
Leadership team is composed of individuals that:	
 have limited content and pedagogical backgrounds in mathematics, science and ESOL education at the secondary school level; 	
 demonstrates insufficient evidence of successful management and sustainability of prior large scale projects; and 	
• demonstrates limited evidence of networking with secondary school level science teachers, higher	
education faculty, and scientists, engineers, and/or mathematicians in the field.	(0 points)

Are mathematics, science and ESOL educators, mathematicians, scientists, and/or engineers, in and out of higher education institutions, playing major roles in the program? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Mathematics, science and ESOL educators, mathematicians, scientists, and/or engineers are clearly described as playing a major role in the design and implementation of the program.	(4 points)
Mathematics, science and ESOL educators, mathematicians, scientists, and/or engineers are described as playing a limited role in the design and implementation of the program.	(2 points)
Mathematics, science and ESOL educators, mathematicians, scientists, and/or engineers are not described as having a role in the design and implementation of the program.	(0 points)

Are the roles of all partners identified? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

All eligible partners and additional identified partners are included in the proposal and the role each plays in the design and implementation of the program is clearly described. On-going involvement of all eligible and additional identified partners in these roles is expected for the life of the grant project.	(3-4 points)
All eligible partners are included in the proposal and the role each plays in the design and implementation of the program is adequately described.	(1-2 points)
All eligible partners are included in the proposal and the role each plays in the design and implementation of the program is unclear.	(0 points)

Does the management plan engage all partners in meaningful ways including charter and nonpublic schools? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The management plan demonstrates extensive involvement of all partners including local charter and nonpublic	
schools.	(3 points)
The management plan demonstrates sufficient involvement of all partners including local charter and nonpublic	
schools.	(1-2 points)
The management plan demonstrates limited involvement of all partners including local charter and nonpublic	
schools.	(0 points)

Is there evidence that grades 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers from participating schools will provide input into all stages of program development? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

Evidence exists that extensively delineates procedures to utilize grades 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers' input through evaluations, group planning, and other input instruments. On-going involvement of all eligible and additional identified partners in these roles is expected for the life of the grant project.	(3 points)
Evidence exists that partially delineates procedures to utilize grades 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers' input through evaluations, group planning, and other input instruments.	(1-2 points)
Evidence exists that minimally delineates procedures to utilize grades 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers' input through evaluations, group planning, and other input instruments.	(0 points)

Is there evidence that partners share goals, responsibilities, and accountability for the proposed work? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

Substantial evidence exists that partners share common goals, share responsibilities, focus on similar outcomes, and each is accountable for successful implementation of the work.	(3 points)
Adequate evidence exists that partners share common goals, share responsibilities, focus on similar outcomes, and each is accountable for successful implementation of the work.	(1-2 points)
Limited evidence exists that partners share common goals, share responsibilities, focus on similar outcomes, and each is accountable for successful implementation of the work.	(0 points)

Does the governance structure describe communication, decision-making and fiscal responsibilities among partners? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

An effective governance structure has been developed that clearly describes methods of communication, the decision-making process, and fiscal responsibilities of each partner, including the high needs school district(s), the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, institutions of higher education, and others as appropriate to the grant.	(3 points)
An adequate governance structure has been developed that partially describes methods of communication, the decision-making process, and fiscal responsibilities of each partner.	(1-2 points)
An inadequate governance structure has been developed with unclear methods of communication, the decision-making process, and fiscal responsibilities of each partner.	(0 points)

II. PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCHED-BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - (47 points possible)

Do the goals focus on improved mathematics and science achievement for ELLs in grades 6-12 and address training of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Program goals are explicitly described as focusing on both:	
 improved mathematics and science achievement related to the standards and expectations for ELLs in grades 6-12, and 	
 training designed to develop teachers as highly qualified mathematics, science and ESOL teachers with emphasis on increasing knowledge and skill in both content and pedagogy. 	(4-5 points)
Program goals are generally described as focusing on both:	
 improved mathematics and science achievement related to the standards and expectations for ELLs in grades 6-12, and 	
training designed to develop teachers as highly qualified mathematics, science and ESOL teachers.	(2-3 points)
The description of program goals is unclear and/or insufficiently focused on both:	
 improved mathematics and science achievement related to the standards and expectations for ELLs in grades 6-12, and 	
 training of teachers related to the qualifications of highly qualified mathematics, science and ESOL 	
teachers.	(0-1 points)

Are goals and objectives well defined, measurable, and tractable? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

All goals/objectives are well defined, stated in measurable terms, and easily tractable.	(3-4 points)
Goals/objectives are generally well defined, stated in measurable terms, and tractable.	(1-2 points)
Goals/objectives are ill-defined, not stated in measurable terms, and/or may not be tractable.	(0 points)

Are goals and objectives aligned to state expectations and national standards? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

All goals/objectives are clearly and directly aligned to specific state and national mathematics, science and ESOL content and process expectations and standards.	(3-4 points)
All goals/objectives are generally aligned to state and national mathematics, science and ESOL content and process expectations and standards.	(1-2 points)
All goals/objectives are insufficiently aligned to state and national mathematics, science and ESOL content and process expectations and standards.	(0 points)

Do proposed strategies and activities address the established goals? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Brief but explicit descriptions of all proposed strategies and activities are provided that present the reader with a clear understanding of how the strategies and activities are directly aligned with and serve to meet all goals of	
the project.	(3-4 points)
Brief descriptions of all proposed strategies and activities are provided that present the reader with a general understanding of how the strategies and activities are aligned with and serve to meet all goals of the project.	
	(1-2 points)
Descriptions of proposed strategies and activities may be omitted or are provided but fail to present the reader with a clear understanding of how strategies and activities are directly aligned with and serve to meet the goals of the project.	(0 points)

Do proposed strategies and activities provide opportunities for ELLs to model real world applications and learn academic language while learning content? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Descriptions of proposed rigorous mathematics, science and ESOL curricular strategies and activities indicate that they are purposely designed to provide explicit opportunities for ELL students to model real world applications of content and process skills, clearly describe how those applications can be made and learn academic language while learning content.	(4-5 points)
Proposed mathematics, science and ESOL curricular strategies and activities are generally designed to provide opportunities for ELL students to model real world applications of content and process skills, describe how those applications can be made and learn academic language while learning content.	(2-3 points)
Proposed mathematics, science and ESOL curricular strategies and activities provide little or no opportunity for ELL students to model real world applications of content and process skills, generally describe how those applications can be made and/or learn academic language while learning content.	
	(0-1 points)

Is it clear how and when the partnership will carry out the activities? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The described plan for the implementation of all partnership activities clearly articulates how and when those activities will be carried out and identifies which members of the partnership will be involved.	(3 points)
The plan for the implementation of all partnership activities generally describes how and when those activities will be carried out and identifies which members of the partnership will be involved.	(1-2 points)
A plan for the implementation of all partnership activities is unclear as to how and/or when those activities will be carried out and which members of the partnership are to be involved.	(0 points)

Are meaningful follow-up activities planned for participants? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Description of the activities designed as follow-up to academy activities are clear, complete, and detailed. All follow-up activities focus on meeting the identified needs of teachers so that increases in teacher knowledge of content, process skills, and pedagogy and gains in student achievement can be realized.	(4-5 points)
Description of the activities designed as follow-up to academy activities are clear and adequate information is provided. Most follow-up activities focus on meeting the needs of teachers so that increases in teacher knowledge of content, process skills, and pedagogy and gains in student achievement can be realized	(2-3 points)
Description of the activities designed as follow-up to academy activities are vague, incomplete, and/or lack detail. Follow-up activities minimally address the needs of teachers.	(0-1 points)

Are planned activities supported by research on effective SIOP professional development practices? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

All planned activities are supported by research on effective SIOP professional development practices. <u>Clear and complete</u> descriptions indicate that professional development: • is sustained and on-going; • requires collaborative/co-teaching efforts between all partners through mentoring and coaching activities; • encourages reflection on academy and classroom activities through co-generative dialoguing between all partners; and	
• is designed to build capacity by creating 6-12 teacher leaders that are both excited and well equipped to provide professional development to fellow teachers at the local and regional levels.	(4-5 points)
Planned activities are supported by research on effective SIOP professional development practices. Descriptions generally indicate that professional development: is on-going; requires collaborative/co-teaching efforts between all partners through mentoring and coaching activities; encourages reflection on academy and classroom activities through co-generative dialoguing between all partners; and is designed to build capacity by creating 6-12 teacher leaders that are equipped to provide professional development to fellow teachers at the local and regional levels.	(2-3 points)
Planned activities are supported by research on effective SIOP professional development practices. Descriptions <u>do not</u> indicate that professional development: is on-going; requires collaborative/co-teaching efforts between all partners; encourages reflection on academy and classroom activities; and is designed to build capacity by creating 6-12 teacher leaders equipped to provide professional development to fellow teachers at the local and regional levels.	(0-1 points)

Are the mentor/coach criteria for selection, role and responsibilities well articulated? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Description of the criteria for selection, role and responsibilities of mentor/coaches is clear, complete, and	
detailed. Criteria focus on demonstration of content and pedagogical expertise, and ability to act as a	
teacher/leader for the grant project and a mentor/coach in support of participant growth.	
The role and responsibilities of the mentor/coach are clearly articulated as they relate to the planning of,	
preparation for, and implementation of all components of the grant project, including summer academy, regular	
mentor/coach activities throughout the school year, and proposed follow-up activities to the academy.	(4.7
	(4-5 points)
Expectations for commitment to the project for all funding years are clearly articulated.	
Description of the criteria for selection, role and responsibilities of mentor/coaches is clear and adequate.	
Criteria focus on demonstration of content and pedagogical expertise, and ability to act as a teacher/leader for	
the grant project and a mentor/coach in support of participant growth.	
The role and responsibilities of the mentor/coach are adequately described as they relate to the planning of,	
preparation for, and implementation of all components of the grant project, including summer academy, regular	
mentor/coach activities throughout the school year, and proposed follow-up activities to the academy.	(2-3 points)
Expectations for commitment to the project for all funding years are noted.	(2-3 points)
Description of the criteria for selection, role and responsibilities of mentor/coaches is vague, incomplete, and/or	
lacks detail. Criteria may include, but not require, demonstration of content and pedagogical expertise, and	
ability to act as a teacher/leader for the grant project and a mentor/coach in support of participant growth.	
ability to act as a teacher/leader for the grant project and a memor/coach in support of participant growth.	
Description of the role and responsibilities of the mentor/coach are vague, incomplete, and/or lacks detail as they	
relate to the planning of, preparation for, and implementation of all components of the grant project.	
return to the planning of, preparation for, and implementation of the components of the grain project.	
Plans for commitment to the project for all funding years are not evident.	(0-1 points)
projection and projection and remaining joints are not extracted	

Are the planned SIOP professional development activities content focused? (0-7 points)

Choose only one

Choose only one	
All planned SIOP professional development activities, including academy and follow-up, are <u>explicitly</u>	
described as focusing on:	
• increasing the subject matter (content and process) knowledge of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers;	
• enhancing the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging Missouri Mathematics & Science	
Expectations and to develop and/or select appropriate content;	
• training mathematics, science and ESOL teachers to use appropriate curricular practices that are inquiry	
and concept-based; and	
 improving and expanding training of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, including teaching skills 	(6-7 points)
necessary for the effective integration of technology into the curricula and instruction.	
All planned SIOP professional development activities, including academy and follow-up, are generally	
described as focusing on:	
• increasing the subject matter (content and process) knowledge of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers;	
• enhancing the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging Missouri Mathematics & Science	
Expectations and to develop and/or select appropriate content;	
• training mathematics, science and ESOL teachers to use appropriate curricular practices that are inquiry	
and concept-based; and	
• improving and expanding training of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, including teaching skills	(4-5 points)
necessary for the effective integration of technology into the curricula and instruction.	
All planned SIOP professional development activities, including academy and follow-up, are <u>insufficiently</u>	
described as focusing on:	
• increasing the subject matter (content and process) knowledge of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers;	
• enhancing the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging Missouri Mathematics & Science	
Expectations and to develop and/or select appropriate content;	
• training mathematics, science and ESOL teachers to use appropriate curricular practices that are inquiry	
and concept-based; and	
• improving and expanding training of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, including teaching skills	(2-3 points)
necessary for the effective integration of technology into the curricula and instruction.	

(continued on next page)

Are the planned SIOP professional development activities content focused? (continued)

Choose only one

All planned SIOP professional development activities, including academy and follow-up, do not focus on:

• increasing the subject matter (content and process) knowledge of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers;

• enhancing the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging Missouri Mathematics & Science Expectations and to develop and/or select appropriate content;

• training mathematics, science and ESOL teachers to use appropriate curricular practices that are inquiry and concept-based; and

• improving and expanding training of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers, including teaching skills necessary for the effective integration of technology into the curricula and instruction.

(0-1)	points))
	POILED	,

III. Evaluation and Accountability Plan - (21 points possible)

Does the evaluation plan support DESE priorities and the established goals and objectives of the proposed project? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Established goals and objectives are rigorously evaluated with appropriate quantitative and qualitative pre/post assessment instruments and procedures for data analysis.	(5 points)
 Measurable outcomes include, but are not limited to, Progress toward meeting the measurable goals and objectives established in response to reduce the number of teachers who do not meet the definition of highly qualified teacher; Number of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers who participate in content-based professional development; Student academic achievement; and Pre/post assessment information on teacher content expertise. (Preference will be given to proposals utilizing external evaluation methods, randomized field trials and/or quasi-experimental evaluation methodology.)	
Established goals and objectives are adequately evaluated with appropriate assessment instruments and procedures for data analysis.	(3-4 points)
Some goals and objectives are evaluated with assessment instruments and procedures for data analysis.	(1–2 points)
Goals and objectives are minimally addressed in the evaluation.	(0 points)

Does the evaluation plan include personnel with the expertise to implement the evaluation design and clearly define their roles, including plans for external evaluation? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Personnel have expertise and documented historical evidence of evaluating professional development programs.	(4 points)
Personnel have expertise and some evidence of evaluating professional development programs.	
	(2-3 points)
Personnel have limited expertise and experience in evaluating professional development programs.	
	(1 point)
Personnel appear to lack the expertise to evaluate this program.	
	(0 points)

Are important outcomes such as teacher SIOP and content expertise, impact on ELL student achievement and highly qualified teachers identified and assessed? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

Important outcomes that impact teacher quality, including SIOP and content expertise, and ELL student achievement are fully identified and thoroughly assessed.	(5 points)
Important outcomes that impact teacher quality, including SIOP and content expertise, and ELL student achievement are identified and assessed.	(3-4 points)
Important outcomes that impact teacher quality, including SIOP and content expertise, and ELL student achievement are indirectly identified and assessed.	(1-2 points)
Important outcomes that impact teacher quality, including SIOP and content expertise, and ELL student achievement are not addressed.	(0 points)

Are procedures for measuring identified outcomes clearly identified? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

A comprehensive plan for measuring identified outcomes, utilizing valid and reliable quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments and methodologies, is clearly and completely described.	(4 points)
 Measurable outcomes include, but are not limited to, Progress toward meeting the measurable goals and objectives established in response to reduce the number of teachers who do not meet the definition of highly qualified teacher; Number of mathematics, science and ESOL teachers who participate in content-based professional development; Student academic achievement; and Pre/post assessment information on teacher content expertise. (Preference will be given to proposals utilizing external evaluation methods, randomized field trials and/or quasi-experimental evaluation methodology.)	
An evaluation plan, utilizing valid and reliable quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis instruments and methodologies, is identified but lacks clarity.	(2-3 points)
Evaluation procedures are minimally addressed or very vague. The plan fails to include and describe both quantitative and qualitative instruments and methodologies.	(1 point)
Evaluation procedures are not addressed.	(0 points)

Will the evaluation contribute to continuous improvement for ELLs' achievement and for teachers' professional growth? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The evaluation drives schools to continuously look for ways to improve ELL achievement and teachers' professional growth. A clear and complete plan for regular analysis of data and communication of progress toward achievement of goals and objectives is described that involves and informs all partners. This description includes plans for sharing information with those outside the project who may also profit from the findings.	(3 points)
The evaluation causes schools to periodically address ELL achievement improvement and teachers' professional growth. An adequate plan for analysis and reporting of data and progress toward achievement of goals and objectives is described that involves and informs all partners.	(2 points)
The evaluation minimally promotes continuous improvement for ELLs. A vague or unclear plan for analysis and reporting of data and progress toward achievement of goals and objectives is described.	(1 point)
The evaluation does not address continuous improvement. A plan for reporting of data and progress toward achievement of goals and objectives is not evident.	(0 points)

IV. Institutional Change and Program Sustainability - (15 points possible)

Is there a clear plan for program continuation after the life of the grant? (0-5 points)

Choose only one

 There is strong evidence that the partnership has the ability to maintain the targeted activities during and beyond the length of the project. A brief description clearly explains how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the grant proposal after the original grant period has expired. This plan for program continuation after the life of the grant explicitly: indicates that all members of the partnership will maintain the targeted activities beyond the length of the project; describes how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the proposal after the original grant has expired, especially the regional academies and collaborative mentor/coaching experiences; describes how all partnership members will actively participate in future professional development for teachers not involved in the original grant program throughout district, regional and state-wide mathematics, science and ESOL teaching/learning communities; and describes on-going professional development opportunities to be provided for present project participants 	
after the original grant has expired.	(4-5 points)
 There is sufficient evidence that the partnership has the ability to maintain the targeted activities during and beyond the length of the project. A brief description adequately explains how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the grant proposal after the original grant period has expired. A plan for program continuation after the life of the grant is generally provided that: indicates that all members of the partnership will maintain the targeted activities beyond the length of the project; describes how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the proposal after the original grant has expired; describes how all program participants will actively participate in future professional development for teachers not involved in the grant program throughout district, regional and state-wide teaching/learning communities; and describes on-going professional development opportunities to be provided for present project participants 	
after the original grant has expired.	(2-3 points)

(continued on next page)

Is there a clear plan for program continuation after the life of the grant? (continued)

There is some evidence that the partnership has the ability to maintain the targeted activities during and beyond the length of the project. A brief description does not adequately explain how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the grant proposal after the original grant period has expired. A plan for program continuation after the life of the grant is provided that is incomplete or fails to:

• indicate that all members of the partnership can maintain the targeted activities beyond the length of the project;

• describe how the partnership will continue the activities funded under the proposal after the original grant has expired;

• describe all program participants will actively participate in future professional development for teachers not involved in the grant program throughout district, regional and state-wide teaching/learning communities; and

• describe on-going professional development opportunities to be provided for present project participants

(0-1 points)

Comments and/or Suggestions:

after the original grant has expired.

Are obstacles to future funding addressed? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

Probable obstacles to future funding necessary for the sustainability of program activities after the original grant period has expired are anticipated and well-defined. A detailed plan for maintaining present resources and obtaining additional monetary and non-monetary resources is provided. Explicit evidence of resource allocation within the core partner organizations necessary for sustainability is provided.	(3 points)
Some obstacles to future funding are identified and a detailed plan for obtaining monetary and non-monetary resources needed to sustain the program is provided. Evidence of resource allocation within the core partner organizations necessary for sustainability is generally provided.	(1-2 points)
Few or no obstacles to future funding are identified and/or a plan for addressing anticipated obstacles is inadequate. Evidence of resource allocation with core partner organizations is lacking.	(0 points)

Are ways to secure additional funding identified? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

A complete and detailed plan for securing additional funding needed for program sustainability and to support institutional change is provided that explicitly identifies all partners responsible for securing such funding, a comprehensive list of sources for additional funding, and the methods to be used in the process of obtaining	
those funds.	(3 points)
A plan for securing additional funding needed for program sustainability and to support institutional change is provided that generally identifies the partners responsible for securing such funds, some sources of additional funding, and the methods to be used in the process of obtaining those funds.	(1-2 points)
The plan for securing additional funding needed for program sustainability and to support institutional change is lacking or inadequately identifies sources of additional funding, the partners responsible for securing such funds, and/or the methods to be used in the process of obtaining those funds.	(0 points)

Do partners provide evidence that the program will lead to change and that changes will be sustainable? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Partners have provided <u>abundant</u> evidence <u>with specifics</u> explaining that:	
• the program will lead to positive changes in their institutions, especially gains in the subject matter	
knowledge and teaching skills of 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers and their students'	
achievement;	
• the capacity for science education leadership will be increased within the grades 6-12 mathematics,	
science and ESOL teaching community and continued growth will be monitored;	
• each partner will develop institutional policies to support and sustain the new roles and responsibilities of	
all partnership members during the program and beyond;	
 plans are detailed for monitoring the on-going impact of the program on teacher efficacy and student 	(3-4 points)
achievement.	
Partners have provided <u>sufficient</u> evidence with <u>some specifics</u> explaining that:	
• the program will lead to positive changes in their institutions, especially gains in the subject matter	
knowledge and teaching skills of 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers and their students'	
achievement;	
• the capacity for science education leadership will be increased within the grades 6-12 mathematics,	
science and ESOL science teaching community and continued growth will be monitored;	
 partners will develop institutional policies to support and sustain the new roles and responsibilities of 	
partnership members during the program and beyond;	
 plans are detailed for monitoring the on-going impact of the program on teacher efficacy and student 	(1-2 points)
achievement.	
Partners have provided some evidence, although it may be weak, explaining that:	
• the program will lead to positive changes in their institutions, especially gains in the subject matter	
knowledge and teaching skills of 6-12 mathematics, science and ESOL teachers and their students'	
achievement;	
• the capacity for science education leadership will be increased within the grades 6-12 mathematics,	
science and ESOL science teaching community and continued growth will be monitored;	
 partners will develop institutional policies to support and sustain the new roles and responsibilities of 	
partnership members during the program and beyond;	
 plans are detailed for monitoring the on-going impact of the program on teacher efficacy and student 	(0 points)
achievement.	

V. Budget and Cost Effectiveness (22 points possible)

Is there a budget narrative that clearly delineates cost and details concerning reasonable expenditures? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

choose only one	
The narrative clearly delineates cost and details concerning reasonable expenditures.	(3 points)
The narrative, with a few exceptions, delineates cost and details concerning reasonable expenditures.	(2 points)
The narrative partially delineates cost and details concerning reasonable expenditures.	(1 point)
The narrative does not delineate cost and details concerning reasonable expenditures.	(0 points)

Do budgeted items directly relate to established goals and objectives? (0-4 points)

Choose only one

Budgeted items directly relate to established goals and objectives.	
	(4 points)
Budgeted items, to a considerable degree, relate to established goals and objectives.	(2-3 points)
Budgeted items partially relate to established goals and objectives.	(1 point)
Budgeted items do not relate to established goals and objectives.	(0 points)

Does the budget reflect the involvement of each partner? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The budget demonstrates that each partner plays a significant role in the project.	(3 points)
The budget demonstrates that each partner plays a role in the project.	(2 points)
The budget demonstrates that some partners play a limited role in the project.	(1 point)
The budget demonstrates that some partners are excluded in playing a role in the project.	(0 points)

Is the requested budget appropriate to achieve the proposed outcomes with regard to the number of 6-12 grade mathematics, science and ESOL teachers and ELL students impacted by the proposed activities? (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The proposed budget convincingly addresses and is appropriate to support the number of 6-12 teachers and students impacted by proposed activities.	(3 points)
The proposed budget adequately accommodates the number of 6-12 teachers and students impacted by proposed activities.	(2 points)
The proposed budget partially addresses the number of 6-12 teachers and students impacted by proposed activities.	(1 point)
The proposed budget is not appropriate to support the number of 6-12 teachers and students impacted by proposed activities.	(0 points)

If the funding is requested to support the purchase of technological tools, are these essential to reach the proposed outcomes? (An effective proposal in science will utilize some forms of technology.) (0-3 points)

Choose only one

The requested technological tools are essential to reach the proposed outcomes.	(3 points)
The requested technological tools will impact the proposed outcomes.	(2 points)
The requested technological tools will somewhat impact proposed outcomes.	(1 point)
The requested technological tools will have little impact on the proposed outcomes.	(0 points)

Does the budget reflect that a major portion of the funds will be directed to support and encourage teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program? (0-6 points)

Choose only one

A major portion of the funding in the proposed budget is focused on supporting and encouraging teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program.	(6 points)
Funding in the proposed budget targeted towards supporting and encouraging teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program is sufficient.	(4-5 points)
Funding in the proposed budget targeted towards supporting and encouraging teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program is marginal.	(2-3 points)
Funding in the proposed budget targeted towards supporting and encouraging teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program is minor.	(1 point)
Funding in the proposed budget targeted towards supporting and encouraging teacher participation in SIOP training and other facets of the program does not exist.	(0 points)